

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

DOMINIQUE ALEXANDER)	
WILLIAMS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	1:23-CV-66
)	
GUILFORD COUNTY JAIL)	
(GREENSBORO), et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

The Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge was filed in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and the Clerk served the recommendation on the plaintiff. The plaintiff filed objections to the recommendation, Doc. 6, along with other paper writings.

In his objections and a supplement filed after the Recommendation was entered, Mr. Williams repeats his request for an attorney and repeats his conclusory assertions that he will be able to prove his case. Docs. 6, 7. But nothing in the objections or the supplement undermines the Magistrate Judge's analysis. At best, he has alleged negligence, not constitutional violations, as it concerns the leak. After *de novo* consideration, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation in full.

Mr. Williams also filed requests for production of documents and interrogatories. This discovery is directed to "the defendants," *see* Docs. 8, 9, and covers items related to the claims dismissed by this Order. A plaintiff is only entitled to discovery if the complaint states a claim; with rare exceptions not applicable here, a litigant is not entitled

to discovery in order to obtain information about whether there are facts to support his claim. Moreover, the remaining defendant, Dr. Haq, has not been served. The Court will strike these discovery requests, without prejudice to service of appropriate discovery on Dr. Haq, after entry of the initial pretrial order. *See* LR 26.1(a).

The plaintiff's attention is directed to the provisions of the Magistrate Judge's Order directed to service of process and payment of an initial filing fee, to which no objection was made. The plaintiff is reminded that failure to obtain timely service of process on Dr. Haq or failure to pay the initial filing fee can result in dismissal of his remaining claim.

It is **ORDERED** that:

1. This case **may proceed** on the plaintiff's claim against defendant Haq for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need.
2. All other claims against all other defendants are **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for failing to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.
3. The requested discovery at Docs. 8 and 9 are **STRICKEN** without prejudice to appropriate interrogatories and requests to produce documents after the Initial Pretrial Discovery Order is entered or at such other time as the Magistrate Judge determines is appropriate.

This the 21st day of February, 2023.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE